

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R004000050005-0 T R Y
D D / S R E G I S T R Y

F I L E *O f M*
DD/S 71-4543

24 NOV 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Communications
Director of Finance
Director of Logistics
Director of Medical Services
Director of Personnel
Director of Security
Director of Training

SUBJECT : Agenda for the Weekend Conference

1. Attached is a proposed agenda for our weekend conference. I believe it covers most of points you have suggested.
2. Most of you expressed a preference for considering the entire agenda rather than having particular topics assigned for presentation and discussion by one or two people. I suggest that you come prepared and plan to speak to each of the agenda items. I would expect that asking one of you to express your ideas first will be sufficient to launch the discussion and that each of you will have the opportunity to express your views in that process. I think it would be preferable to avoid the highly structured format of going around the table for each individual to express his own views.
3. Each item is followed by a series of questions. I would not expect everyone to attempt to provide answers to every question. The questions are intended to provoke thought and to bring some focus to each of the topics.
4. If you have alternative topics, suggestions for modification of these, or any other comments, or if you feel these are altogether bad and we should start over again please say so. I would like to have your comments by close of business Monday, 29 November so we can make whatever revisions are necessary and get the agenda back to you in time for you to collect your thoughts before Friday.

ERCP P 1

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R004000050005-0

66 - 174748

5. Tentatively I would like to close out item 1 Friday evening and the remaining items before dinner Saturday. Saturday evening we might discuss some miscellaneous items and do a wrap-up Sunday morning. I attach a copy of an article which might suggest some Saturday night discussion. If you have suggestions about the timing, I would appreciate hearing those, too. We will have a better fix on the timing for each item when we produce the final agenda early next week.

6. Team building seems beyond the scope of our present purpose. Relationships with the Executive Director might be discussed Saturday evening or perhaps at a later time in a separate context. Personnel management and the Career Service is worth separate consideration too, and goes farther out into the Agency arena than the focus of the other topic. I doubt that we have time to do the subject justice.



John W. Coffey
Deputy Director
for Support

Attachments

25X1

SOS/DD/S: [redacted] bbt (23 Nov 71)

Distribution:

Orig - D/OC *apical by hand*
1 - Ea other adse *whit. by hand*
 - DD/S Subject w/atts
1 - DD/S Chrono
1 - SOS Chrono

~~SECRET~~

Office Director's Conference
Agenda

1. Management Planning

Is planning apart from the PPB requirement, a meaningful management practice? What can we do to make planning a more meaningful tool? Should we try? If we don't plan, how do we know we're making progress? How can we evaluate performance? How can we keep plans current? Is it important to evaluate progress continuously? If not, why not? If yes, how can we go about it meaningfully? Are we destined perpetually to crisis management? In the face of your demanding day to day chores and responsibilities, how do you find the time for contemplation, reflection, study, and thoughtful consideration of your challenging unsolved problems? Is there some way we can improve our individual and collective approaches to identifying and solving problems, developing new theories and practices, pushing the state of your/our arts? How do we go about it? Are "Problem Solving Seminars" a useful device? Should the DD/S state Directorate objectives--goals and issue overall guidelines? How often? In what terms? Are there Directorate objectives above and beyond the aggregate of the objectives of the individual offices? If you were asked to help with the development of Directorate objectives and goals, how would you respond? What other management techniques are there that we can use in addition to--instead of--traditional management planning?

2. Interrelationships Among the Support Offices

What is your view of your role in relation to other offices in the Support Directorate? Do relationships vary from office to office? At all levels? Is that bad? How do you relate to the Directors of other Support Offices now? Do you feel change is desirable? What changes would you propose? How do your subordinates relate to their peers in other Support Offices now? Do you feel change is desirable? What changes would you propose? What are the differences in the roles of the Support Offices as you see them? The similarities? Can we identify a thread of unity? Is unity (cohesiveness) or the lack of unity (cohesiveness) a significant factor or problem? What solutions would you propose? Do we have "layering" problems within the individual offices? How do we correct them? Can you identify and define the "management" problems that you consider to be the most significant at the office level? What solutions to those problems would you propose?

~~SECRET~~

3. Relationships with the DD/S

What is your view of your role in relation to the Deputy Director for Support? How do you feel this compares with the Directors of the other Support Offices? Do you feel changes are desirable? What changes would you propose? Do we have "layering" problems within the Directorate? How do we correct it? Can you identify and define the management problems that you consider to be most significant at the Directorate level? What solutions to those problems would you propose? How do you view the role of the Staff of the DD/S? What suggestions do you have for changing/improving that role? Should we have a "DD/S MAG"? Should we have an IG type function at the Directorate level? Should we reactivate the notion of a Resources Allocation Board?

4. Role and Image of the Support Directorate

The philosophy of the Support Directorate has been that we are a service organization. Is that the right philosophy for the future? How should we change it? What is our image? Are we regarded as the housekeepers? Is that bad? How would you change it? Are we too defensive in considering image? Is the housekeeper image real or is it the view of a small segment of the population--the youth--the mid-careerists? How do we counter it and prevent its further development? Should we seek a more active and influential role? Are we passive now? Are we without influence now? Where is our influence felt most now? Least? Is that good or bad? What needs to be changed? How do we go about effecting that change? Do we want a proactive (vice reactive) and participatory role? What does this really mean? How can we ensure that the Support Directorate maintains a vigorous and aggressive posture in relation to other components? Does the Support Directorate have more than one role--service (housekeeper) plus one or more others? What is (are) it (they)? Do we support, administer, or manage? In some combination? (see Webster's).

SECRET
EYES ONLYD D / S R A
FILE OEA

DD/S 71-4331

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Attached is a copy of a memorandum describing our discussion last Saturday morning. If you have any changes or corrections, or if there is a point you would like to elaborate more fully, please feel free to do so.

In reflecting further on some parts of Saturday's discussion I think it would be useful to ask you to identify types of information and action items that now go to the Executive Director-Comptroller that should or need go only to the Deputy Director for Support, and to have some examples of kinds of items on which we have the authority but check with the Executive Director-Comptroller anyway.

In developing further plans for the out-of-town conference, should we--would it be useful to attempt any "team building"--that is, some open, candid but well-meaning constructive discussion about individual styles and performances?

Would it be useful to ask each of you to take a topic agreed upon beforehand and develop your thinking about it for presentation to the group? Would it be useful to ask each of you to develop your thinking about item 1 from the list distributed Saturday, for example, or would it be more useful to ask each of you to take a different item from that list or one not included on that list for individual development and presentation? If you think this would be useful, which item would you elect to develop?

Do you think we should distribute an agenda a few days before the weekend conference? Should it be relatively loose or should we allot a certain time period for the discussion of each item?

Could I have your thinking on these questions within the week, please?

Robert S. Wattles

EYES ONLYS E C R E T
Downgrading and
Declassification

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R004000050005-0

Approved For Release 2003/05/27 : CIA-RDP84-00780R004000050005-0

SECRET **EYES ONLY**

8 November 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Support Planning

1. On Saturday morning 6 November 1971 the Directors of the Support Offices met with the Deputy Director for Support and the Assistant Deputy Director for Support from 9 a.m. until 12 noon. Present were Messrs. [redacted] Fisher, Osborn, Bush, Cunningham, Blake, Wattles, Coffey, Dr. Tietjen, and the undersigned.

2. Mr. Coffey introduced the meeting by relating a luncheon conversation he had with Mr. Helms about ten days earlier. Mr. Helms had informed Mr. Coffey that the Director's role in the community was expected to expand which would mean that he would have less time to devote to internal Agency affairs and other people would be expected to do more and different things. Mr. Helms mentioned that with the retirement of Colonel White he would be expecting to look to the DD/S for answers which he would not expect to be able to get from Mr. Colby because of his different background and experience. Mr. Helms had also made a point that he would have to be more completely reliant upon Mr. Coffey to assure that the right Support people are placed in the right jobs. Mr. Helms is anxious to avoid moving the "same bunch of old joes" around in the senior positions.

3. Mr. Coffey went on to say that we have an opportunity now to do more on our own cognizance and our own initiative. It is reasonable to assume that roles will be changing elsewhere in the Agency and this is quite likely to mean that other Directorates and senior subordinate echelons will be looking more to the Support Directorate than has been typical in the past. In the Clandestine Service, for example, while we may not be relied upon for as much contribution as we might like, we may find that they will not be as resistant to an expanding role for the Support Directorate as we might have expected.

SECRET **EYES ONLY**

GROUP 1
EXEMPTED from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

~~SECRET EYES ONLY~~

4. In a later conversation with Mr. Colby it became evident that there will be a different relationship between the Executive Director-Comptroller and the DD/S simply by reason of differing personalities and antecedents. The Executive Director-Comptroller will have to look to us more for action and decision than has been true in the past. We need to decide what we would like the DD/S to do as we look ahead--what should the goals and objectives be?

5. Mr. Coffey alluded to the Support Conference and the question raised there by consensus of the group about whether the Support Directorate should be more management oriented or should continue to play the role of the servant--helper to people elsewhere in the Agency. Mr. Wattles distributed copies of my memorandum to him dated 4 November 1971 (copy attached) and Mr. Coffey asked those present to review it briefly and offer their observations about whether this is on the right track. We have an opportunity to establish a different set of relationships and we need to consider what they should be if, indeed, we should make any effort to change them. By way of example, Mr. Coffey alluded to our support to Laos indicating that we have not had a part in the planning and forecasting and, in fact, the Executive Director has been cut out of at least part of it. If any or all of these points are valid, if we think we should adjust, do we have a place to start and how do we go about it?

6. Mr. Wattles noted that these items are a distillate of input from the individual Office Directors, items discussed at the Support Conference, and some thought and discussion by members of the staff in the Office of the DD/S. There was considerable evidence at the Support Conference that the young and mid-career officers are dedicated and loyal members of the Agency and the career service but they are disturbed by the "housekeeper image" of Support. If we don't change that image we will not be able to attract and hold the caliber of young officers that we have been employing.

7. Mr. Fisher commented that the Director and Colonel White are dedicated to decentralized personnel management and there will never be a personnel "czar." The DD/P is the boss overseas and that is not likely to change nor is it desirable that it should. Mr. Wattles commented that the emphasis on decentralized personnel management overlooks the impact of the past few years of centralized personnel management attention to such things as the succession problem. A point should be made of the desirability of redoing the whole philosophy of personnel management.

8. Mr. Bush observed that we do not have an Agency management philosophy. We have a lot of individual fiefdoms. We may make studies and offer proposals about any issue dealing with policy but our recommendations can be blocked by our own GS-12 and 13 careerists assigned to the Area Divisions. He commented that he is not convinced that it would be workable to have our own positions throughout the world although it is evident that we suffer by not being able to have the final say in the selection of people to fill Support positions.

~~SECRET EYES ONLY~~

~~SECRET EYES ONLY~~

9. Mr. Osborn observed that there is a lack of true knowledge throughout the rest of the Agency about what Support is and does. Everybody takes Support for granted but they don't really have an appreciation of what we do. We have to do something to change the whole Support image beginning at the grass-roots. One way of getting at this would be to really beef-up our presentations in all of the training courses where Support components appear as speakers and we should not be shy or backward.

10. Mr. Blake commented that he was struck by item 3 and wondered whether we are giving our attention to the right illness. Each of the Support components performs its own function outstandingly but without always having the benefit of enough knowledge about the problems of other individual Support Offices. He cited several examples where he felt that he, as the Director of Logistics, had knowledge that might have been beneficial to the Director of Communications and vice versa and pointed to other offices in the same way. He mentioned that other Deputy Directors meet daily for short sessions with their senior subordinates and, acknowledging that geography was a problem, suggested that consideration be given to similar sessions in the Support Directorate. There was some discussion of the adequacy versus inadequacy of communications at working levels in each of the components but Mr. Blake came back to the point that he felt there was a need for better and more frequent communication among those present.

11. Dr. Tietjen wondered whether we have identified the right patient and noted that history is an important factor in any diagnostic process. In considering whether we should attempt to exert more power or control we should be aware that where we are today is an accommodation of all of the power struggles that have taken place through the years. Mr. Blake then summarized many of the significant events and circumstances that had occurred in the historical evolution of the Support Directorate with some of the blanks being filled in by others present. There was general agreement that the individual offices and the Directorate as a whole have come a long way toward having a recognized position in the Agency since the 1950 to 1954 years, but there was no suggestion direct or implied that we should allow it to rest there.

12. Mr. Cunningham offered the opinion that parochialism is one of our real problems--there is a real difficulty in not knowing what jobs need doing. Ideally we should all have the attitude that we are working for CIA but this clearly is not the case in the Clandestine Service. There is still a strong feeling of separatism among many of the old hands who resent any tendency toward breaking it down. Nevertheless tremendous progress has been made and the younger people moving into the Clandestine Service through the CT Program are playing a part in the erosion of the separatist philosophy. In response to a question from one of the others present Mr. Cunningham offered the opinion that the young people may, to some extent, as they become older adopt the philosophy of the older hands but still this will be much less controlling than it is today.

~~SECRET EYES ONLY~~

SECRET EYES ONLY

25X1 13. Mr. Fisher said that he believes strongly in the theory of command responsibility and that Support people have to be responsive to the command jurisdiction they serve.

14. [redacted] observed that the Senior Seminar offers an outstanding opportunity to educate and inform senior officers from other Directorates about the Support mission, role, and contribution. Mr. Blake agreed and observed that participants in the course are an effective leavening influence.

15. Referring back to the "agenda," Mr. Wattles observed that the peculiar contribution Colonel White has been able to make to the Director and to Agency management is the product not only of his personality but of his years as the architect and builder of the Support Directorate and Support mechanism in the Agency. There has been an unconscious reliance among Directors of Support Offices and the DD/S upon Colonel White to bridge any gaps which may occur in Support staffing of items for consideration by the most senior levels of Agency management. To a degree this reliance has resulted in a carelessness and inadvertent lack of attention to the need for awareness among ourselves individually of the implications a given circumstance or situation may have for one or more of our Support colleagues. Mr. Colby won't be equipped to fill that role and the habit of abdicating to Colonel White must change. Mr. Cunningham commented that by becoming accustomed to not making our own decisions and pushing even minor matters to the top has had a depressant effect upon leadership development. Comments made by Mr. Colby during a recent appearance in one of the training courses suggests that he intends to recognize the direct chain of command from the Director to the DDCI and the Deputies. While this may be his intent, there was some discussion about whether it will in fact prove practical for him to stand aside in the fashion that implies. It may be inevitable that he will become the final arbiter on problems between Directorates. Mr. Fisher commented that the DD/S himself has gone to Colonel White more than may have been necessary. Mr. Coffey commented that he has been surprised at Deputies meetings and other forums that Colonel White has been allowed to become the Support Officer. Other Deputies offer suggestions to him that perhaps should have been offered to us and he posed the question how do we get the other Deputies to look to us?

16. Mr. Osborn noted that there "is a crack in the door" and now is the best time for the Support Directorate to move in whatever direction we feel we should take.

17. Mr. Cunningham suggested that there be a monthly meeting of all Office Directors and Division Chiefs with the Director as was done for a time during the administration of Allen Dulles. Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Coffey how often he met with senior Support Officers throughout the Agency, citing [redacted] as an example. Mr. Bush expanded on a thought wondering how often we in the Support Directorate go to the other Deputies with an idea or a suggestion.

SECRET EYES ONLY

~~SECRET EYES ONLY~~

18. Mr. Fisher asked, rhetorically, "do you feel you don't participate enough?" Mr. Blake commented that the role of the Office of Logistics and its acceptance generally is in pretty fair balance when it comes to implementing things which other Directorates want to do but he feels we might have a more significant contribution to make if we were involved early enough in the planning. He feels that Directors of the Support Offices are well enough informed on most issues to be able to make reasonable comments and suggestions about particular operations, citing Laos as an example. He went on to say that the problem is not so much in how we as offices relate to other components of the Agency but how as Office Directors we relate to each other. The offices can stand on their own; the Directorate as a Directorate is the issue.

19. Dr. Tietjen wondered whether there isn't also an area to be explored that has something to do with the role of the Director in the community. Mr. Cunningham expressed the opinion that the reorganization of the intelligence community will have a profound impact on all of the Support elements. In the normal course of events it is only natural to expect that the Director will turn for support and assistance to those he knows best.

20. There was some general discussion about communication among the Support Offices and the DD/S with a view expressed that the Directorate is better unified than the "agenda" implies. The opinion was offered that while the "stylized" Tuesday morning staff meetings may help Office Directors to understand each other better, the kind of meeting held this morning is far more productive and useful. One to one relationships between individual Office Directors is good but a collective interchange has been missing. A suggestion was offered that "executive sessions" become a regular part of the Tuesday morning sessions after the other business has been concluded. There was some concern that if we tried to "systematize" communications too much we may tend to become more involved with the "system" to the detriment of what is really intended.

21. Dr. Tietjen wondered whether it would be possible or if there is any way that some type of analysis of the Executive Director-Comptroller's job might be done in order to identify things that might be taken to Mr. Colby with a suggestion for redefinition.

22. Dr. Tietjen suggested that each office submit another paper with today's discussion as background for consideration in the development of an agenda for an out-of-town conference. Mr. Coffey agreed that this would be useful.

SECRET EYES ONLY

23. There was some preliminary discussion of a date for the out-of-town conference with agreement that calendars should be reviewed the first of the week and perhaps a date could be settled upon at the Tuesday staff meeting.



cc: Each attendee

Distribution:

Orig - DD/S Subject

~~1 - DD/S Chrono~~

1 - SOS Chrono

SECRET EYES ONLY